

REMARKS

Claim 20 has been added to recite that a particular group of compounds from the larger group of compounds recited in claim 1 in connection with recitation of the compound containing at least one carboxylic group.

Entry of the above amendment is respectfully requested.

Obviousness Rejection

On page 2 of the Office Action, in paragraph 2, claims 1, 2, and 5-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oshima et al (EP 1176467) in view of Tutt et al (5,985,526) and Muller et al (EP129343).

In response, Applicant notes initially that Tutt (USP 5,985,526) discloses a thermal recording element, and an overcoat layer that may contain a UV absorber to prevent dye degradation.

However, what is disclosed in Tutt is the thermal recording element that could be used as a mask placed over the printing plate, and Applicant submits that the thermal recording element could not be used as a printing plate itself.

In particular, while Tutt mentions printing plates at, e.g., col. 4, line 62 and col. 5, line 11, the thermal recording element of Tutt is used as a mask placed over the printing plate, not as a printing plate itself (see, e.g., col. 4, lines 57-62 and col. 5, lines 10-12).

For this reason, Applicant submits that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have applied Tutt's teaching of an overcoat layer containing a UV absorber to Oshima's protective

layer. Accordingly, there would have been no motivation to combine the two references to arrive at the present invention.

Due to the difference in the technology field, the effect of containing a UV absorber in Tutt is completely different from that of the present invention. Applicant submits that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have thought of using the UV absorber disclosed in Tutt to improve handling under white light (safelight property) of a planographic printing plate that is exposed by infrared laser light.

With respect to newly added claim 20 in particular, it is submitted that Muller's paragraph [0036] noted by the Examiner in the first full sentence on page 3 of the Office Action neither teaches nor suggests a phthalic acid derivative, a trimellitic acid derivative, a pyromellitic acid derivative, or a succinic acid derivative as specifically recited in the new claim. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 20 is not obvious over the cited art for this additional reason.

Thus, Applicant submits that the present invention is not obvious over the cited art, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Application No. 10/779,788

Attorney Docket No. Q79792

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,


Bruce E. Kramer
Bruce E. Kramer
Registration No. 33,725

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: November 13, 2006